



QUINCY PLANNING BOARD

Quincy City Hall, 1305 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA 02169
(617) 376-1362 FAX (617) 376-1097
TTY/TDD (617) 376-1375

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, March 12, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman William Geary, Coleman Barry, Glen Comiso, James Fay, Richard Meade

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Dennis E. Harrington, Planning Director
Christine Chaudhary, Planning Board Recording Secretary
Robert Stevens, Urban Renewal Planner
Nicholas Verenis, Economic Development

Meeting called to order and attendance roll call taken at 7:02 PM by Chairman William Geary.

7:05 PM VOTE TO ACCEPT FEBRUARY 12, 2014, PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MOTION: by Member Meade to approve the February 12, 2014, Planning Board meeting minutes

SECOND: Member Barry

VOTE: 4-0 MOTION CARRIES (Member Fay abstained, as he did not attend the February 12th meeting.)

BUSINESS MEETING: (continued later in the meeting)

Agenda Item 3: Execute Planning Board Decision: 6-8 Old Colony Avenue, Special Permit-Site Plan Review, Planning Board Case No. 2013-16

- Planning Board Decision is to be finalized under the guidance of Kristina Johnson, Planning Transportation Director, working with the proponent.

Other:

The next Planning Board meeting was set for April 16, 2014, the third Wednesday of April.

7:10 PM Public Hearing, 20 Fort Street, Special Permit-Site Plan Review, Planning Board Case No. 2013-17

Note: Planning Director Dennis E. Harrington is recused from working this case and was not present in the meeting room.

Chairman Geary read into the record: In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 40A, Section 11 MGL and Title 17 of the Quincy Municipal Code, the Quincy Planning Board will

hold a public hearing on Wednesday, March 12, 2014 at 7:10 P.M. in the new City Council Chambers, 2nd Floor, Quincy City Hall Annex, 1305 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA, on the application of Austin Realty Proprietorship South, LLC, Steven Austin, Manager, for a Special Permit, Site Plan Review, Finding and Parking Waivers under Quincy Zoning Ordinance Title 17, Sections 5.1.17, 8.1, 8.3, 9.4 and 9.5. The proposed work site is located at 20 Fort Street and the proposal is to convert the existing 5,679 square foot office building into 14 studio apartments. The lot is 7,344 square feet. The land is within the QCD-10 District and Flood Plain Overlay District and is shown on Assessors' Map 1166 as Pt. Lot 6, Plot 44.

Attorney Christopher Harrington, Law Offices at 1495 Hancock Street, Quincy, stated that he represents Austin Realty Proprietorship South, LLC, Mr. Steven Austin, Manager. Mr. Austin was present at the meeting. Attorney Harrington reiterated that this is an application for a Special Permit, Flood Plain, Finding, and a request for a Parking Waiver. The building was built in 1900 as a residential home. A large addition was added to the back of the building in 1985, and the building was converted to an office building. Attorney Harrington explained that the building was not constructed properly--the first floor was constructed below base flood elevation, including the electrical system. The proposal is to convert the building into 14 studio apartments, Residential use. The building will be gutted and raised to get the first floor out of the flood zone, which resulted in a challenging design for the handicap ramp.

Mr. Jim Burke, PLS, DeCelle Burke & Associates, Quincy, quickly explained the parking layout done "originally", which is small and difficult to maneuver, he stated. Raising the building out of the flood zone allowed the opportunity to add some roof recharge under the building. He stated that the proposal's stormwater calculations are slightly improved over what exists because a small amount of impervious area would be added. Runoff remains about the same. Mr. Burke stated that there will be a new fire pipe and a new handicap ramp. Chairman Geary asked Mr. Burke to point out the handicap ramp, which is quite long and switches back and forth four times. The grade is 12 to 1 with handrails. Mr. Burke explained that the water goes through the building's flood panels into the flood plain.

There were questions from the Chair about the shaded areas showing on the display plan, to which Attorney Harrington explained that one shaded area belongs to the City and is the area (3,600 sf) which the Applicant is seeking to own for additional parking—the area related to the parking waiver request. Attorney Harrington also pointed out land that the City is not selling (about 2,000 sf)--the land around the Town Brook culvert on the site, and there is also abutting land owned by others. Attorney Harrington stated that the land the City is selling is listed in the Central Register for sale, and that the proponent has given the City an offer to buy the land along with a check, and will bid on the property next month when the process is open for bids. The proponent does not own the property needed to comply with parking requirements at this time, Attorney Harrington stated. The entire parcel is paved. In response to questions from the Chairman, Attorney Harrington stated that 20 Fort Street has been parking on the parcel of discussion since the 1980's, but without owning it and without having the burden of paying taxes.

In response to Member Barry's questions, the landscaping was explained. Attorney Harrington pointed out a three-foot strip between the property line and the parking which will

have a fence and be landscaped, and the landscaping along the side of the building and around the building area will be cleaned up. Along Fort Street, there is a small lawn area that will be cleaned up, keeping the grass and adding new plantings. Attorney Harrington stated that there is a landscaping plan which was filed last summer with the project that was withdrawn (Case No. 2013-11) and was refiled with the current project materials. Mr. Steve Austin, Realty Proprietorship South, LLC, answered questions about the outside of the building. With blue being the main color of the three floor building, the plan is to keep some of the siding from the second floor up, and the first floor will be decorative siding.

Member Comiso asked about occupancy, and Mr. Austin stated that the target tenant for each of the 14 “high-end” studio units is a single professional commuter, as the MBTA station is within walking or biking distance. The goal is to have 1 parking spot per unit. (Note: There is a request for a parking waiver due to the lack of having the 14 required spaces at this time.) The units are from 250-400 square feet. Member Barry spoke about Quincy’s push to be bike friendly, and the development’s proximity (about ½ mile) from the Quincy MBTA station. Mr. Austin stated that the final plans will include room for bike storage within the units, such as hanging bike racks.

Attorney Harrington respectfully requested that the Board approve the project this evening: including to approve the Special Permit, approve the Finding for change of use, and approve the parking waiver. Attorney Harrington stated that in all likelihood the Applicant will own the City land within six weeks that will be used for the additional required parking.

Mr. Robert Stevens, Urban Renewal Planner, and the project manager for this proposal, submitted a departmental recommendation letter to the Board (3/12/14). Mr. Stevens introduced the City’s peer review consultant Mr. Jim White, PE, HW Moore Associates, Boston.

Mr. White stated that he submitted an initial peer review report in November 2013 (11/8/13) and most of the issues have been addressed, including: building elevation, handicap ramp and access, driveway widening. My main concern, Mr. White stated, is that the applicant does not own the property where most of the parking is proposed. He pointed out that the parking that is available on the proponent’s property is accessible only over the property that is now owned by the City. Mr. White stated that the proposal slightly improves stormwater drainage over existing conditions, and Mr. White spoke briefly about other items listed in the peer review report that could be implemented to improve the project. Mr. White pointed out that there is a new door on the north side of the building and while the stairs are within the property line, there is nowhere to walk unless you cross someone else’s property. You cannot have access to/from a building to the dead end of the property line. Also, handicap access requires signs and parking, and safe access through the building and out to the street—none provided on plans.

Chairman Geary asked the proponent’s team to address the points Mr. White made. Mr. Burke spoke about drainage, stating that he has knowledge about the area’s drainage due to his prior work in the area related to the 6 Fort Street project (Planning Board Case Number 2009-04). Mr. Burke stated that the site itself is small, and runoff contributes to the

catch basin on 6 Fort Street, then runs to the Shaw's/Star Market supermarket property. Due to complications with designing a new drainage system for the site—such as the close proximity of the Town Brook and environmental regulations that may come into play—Mr. Burke stated that it was easier as well as a good solution to clean the roof runoff and recharge into the ground. Mr. Burke stated that the proponent will accommodate whatever the City desires for stormwater management, as well as handicap accessibility issues. Mr. Burke agreed to the Chairman's comment that this matter will be cleared up under the Building Permit phase of the project. Attorney Christopher Harrington explained the site challenges caused by designing in the handicap ramp, and he stated the north side door mentioned by Mr. White was designed to be for emergency egress. Attorney Harrington also stated that this site is only about two percent (2%) of the size of the supermarket's entire property, and his feeling is that the amount of water the proposed project would send into that drainage system is de minimis. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr. Jim Burke agreed that the past statements of the proponent's team in relation to the north side stairway's egress being on the adjoining property (not owned by the proponent) is that the stairway's purpose is for emergency egress. Mr. Burke also stated that this particular access acts as a 30-foot fire lane for the building at 6 Fort Street and acts as a pedestrian cut-through also. Attorney Harrington also stated that the north side stairway and door could be re-designed to be contained within the building footprint, though noting that a representative from Donahue Architects was not present.

7:43 PM: Mr. Robert Stevens, Urban Renewal Planner, and the project manager, stated that this proposal was submitted and withdrawn without prejudice back in the summer of 2013 (Planning Board Case 2013-11). The proposal was refiled back in October 2013, and a comment letter was received from the Director of Inspectional Services stating that the project is within the flood plain, and the public hearing was continued a number of times to address that issue. Mr. Stevens stated that the Conservation Commission heard this case: a Notice of Intent was filed and the case was heard last week, and a draft Order of Conditions was provided to you listing Conditions. Mr. Stevens stated that he does not have any issues with flood plain at this time. In 1985, when the building became a commercial building, there was a lease agreement between the owner at the time and the City of Quincy to lease adjacent land for parking purposes, stated Mr. Stevens, which satisfied the parking requirement at that time. The owner foreclosed back then, and the lease for parking was terminated, Mr. Stevens explained. In June 2013, the City Council declared the subdivision of a portion of that land, and declared that land as surplus and ready for disposal/sale. Mr. Stevens stated that the Massachusetts Central Register has the listing and the land is available for purchase proposals from anyone wishing to buy the land. The Applicant has submitted an offer to purchase the land and submitted a down-payment check that the City Solicitor is holding. Currently, the proposed project has seven parking spaces on the site, and 14 spaces are required for the 14 units. Mr. Stevens stated that there are still some unresolved issues with the water runoff from the parking area (not the building) that he feels can be resolved between the City and the Applicant provided that the Applicant is able to purchase the land needed.

Chairman Geary explained the Public Hearing process, where the public has the option to either speak or sign in favor or in opposition to a proposal, to comment or ask a question, or submit written comments.

Ms. Lilla Johnson, 139 School Street, Quincy, stated that she appreciates the landscaping comments. She describes the section of the property that drops where there is a huge granite wall, and she stated that landscaping would be very nice in that location. She asked to learn about any lighting plan, as it was not discussed. She stated that she is in favor of the development, but not as sure about having the number of 14 studio apartments. Attorney Harrington stated that there is only one light pole for the parking lot--which will have a shielded fixture. Attorney Harrington stated that he will work with any issues Ms. Johnson might have.

No others spoke, and no-one signed in favor or in opposition to the project.

7:51 PM

MOTION: by Member Meade to close the Public Hearing

SECOND: Member Fay

VOTE: 5-0 MOTION CARRIES

Mr. Robert Stevens, made his departmental recommendation to the Board (as listed in his 3/12/14 memo to the Planning Board):

- Deny request for Parking waiver. (There is no lease in place or parcel owned at this time that will solve the inadequate parking area size.)
- Issue a Variance for Minimum Lot Size requirement under the Quincy Zoning Ordinance Section 8.3.3.1. (Lot is below the 15,000 sf lot size required under Quincy Center District Zoning whether the proponent acquires the additional parcel from the City or not.)
- Find that the change of use from commercial to multi-family residential is not more detrimental to the neighborhood.
- Approve Special Permit Application to include the following conditions:
 1. The Applicant shall comply with the Quincy Zoning Ordinance Title 17 Section 7.1 Affordable Housing Ordinance.
 2. Applicant must comply with the Engineering Department comment letter dated March 11, 2014 prior to the issuance of a building permit.
 3. Applicant is to take all steps, including submitting a responsive bid to acquire adjacent land from the City of Quincy, to acquire additional parking either through lease, purchase, or other legally binding arrangement to provide for adequate parking for the proposed project.
 4. Upon acquisition of additional parking area, the Applicant shall submit a revised parking plan detailing parking spaces, dumpster location, and landscaping. Plan to reflect comments on parking area and stormwater effects from the City Engineer dated March 11, 2014 and Peer Review Report from HW Moore dated March 10, 2014. Said revised Parking Plan to be approved by the City Engineer.

Chairman Geary, confirmed that the process for the City to sell the parcel of land needed to meet parking requirements should culminate by April 15th. Mr. Stevens stated that April 15th would end the advertisement of the land. The City would then review bids, and the City Council would ultimately vote on the sale of the land.

The Chairman asked if the recommendation to deny the request for the Parking waiver would require the Applicant to come before the Board for approval on that issue. Mr. Stevens stated that he would need to seek additional guidance on that question. In response to Member Meade's question, Attorney Harrington stated that acquiring the additional parcel of land would satisfy the parking requirement for the proposed 14 studio apartments.

Attorney Harrington respectfully asked the Board to approve the parking waiver this night, as under proposed Condition Number 3, the Applicant is obligated to acquire or lease property to provide the required parking. If you grant the parking waiver along with the proposed Conditions, the City's interests will be met, Attorney Harrington stated.

The Chairman stated that if the proponent is not able to secure the proper space for required parking, then the proponent cannot proceed with the project, and stressed Condition Number 3. Attorney Harrington agreed. The Chairman stated that it seems redundant to also deny the parking waiver, as Condition Number 3 prohibits the project without the required space for parking. Correct, stated Attorney Harrington. Again, the Chairman stated that if the proponent is unable to secure the extra required space for parking, the project cannot proceed. The Chairman recommended that the parking waiver be approved, with the emphasis that the project cannot proceed without the extra required space being acquired--assuring the City's Code is complied with. If you cannot obtain the space for required parking, the Chairman stated that the proponent may be before this Board again, as the Board maintains vigilance on this matter, as do the other permitting authorities, as to the proponent's compliance with the order. Attorney Harrington agreed. There was more discussion, with the Chairman reiterating that any project work proceeds at the proponent's "own risk" (raising the building or any other work).

Member Meade stated that he has a problem—"personal problem"--with the fact that the parking ratio without the additional spaces is at 1 dwelling unit to ½ parking space. There was more dialogue between the Chairman and Attorney Harrington, with the Chairman stating that this Board is not going to approve a building start unless the requisite number of parking spaces meets the City's requirement. After comment by Attorney Harrington, the Chairman stated that if the additional parking spaces cannot be acquired, the proponent would need to come before the Board with a new proposal: 7 parking spaces = 7 dwelling units. Any building is at the proponent's own risk until the parking requirement is met. The petitioner needs to satisfy the parking requirement of 14 spaces for 14 dwelling units, stated Chairman Geary.

There was final discussion between the Applicant's attorney Christopher Harrington and Planning Board Members, with Member Meade expressing his strong concern over the parking requirement not being met. Discussion culminated with the Chairman and other Members stressing that any work done to the building before the required number of parking

spaces are available for the proposed 14-unit building would be at the owner's own risk. The proponent understood and agreed.

8:13 PM:

MOTION: by Member Comiso to:

- approve the parking waiver;
- issue a variance for minimum lot size requirement under the Quincy Zoning Ordinance Section 8.3.3.1;
- find that the change of use from commercial to multi-family residential is not more detrimental to the neighborhood;
- approve the Site Plan and Special Permit Application with conditions, to include those listed in the 3/12/14 Planning Department's recommendation letter from Mr. Robert Stevens, Urban Renewal Planner. (listed in the Conditions of Approval section of this document);
- the Special Permit is invalid if the required number of parking spaces for the 14 proposed units are not acquired.

SECOND: Member Fay

VOTE: 4 YES: Members Barry, Comiso, Fay and Chairman Geary

1 NO: Member Meade

MOTION CARRIES

(Brief Recess)

**8:15 P.M. Public Hearing, 39 (-47) Fayette Street, Site Plan Review,
Planning Board Case No. 2014-02**

Note: Planning Director Dennis E. Harrington came back into the meeting room.

Chairman Geary read into the record: In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 40A, Section 11 MGL and Title 17 of the Quincy Municipal Code, the Quincy Planning Board will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, March 12, 2014 at 7:20 P.M. (actual start time 8:15 P.M.) in the 2nd floor Conference Room, Quincy City Hall Annex, 1305 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA, on the application of Galvin Development Company for approval under the Quincy Zoning Ordinance, Title 17, Section 9.5 (Site Plan Review) for the removal of the existing commercial building at 39 (-47) Fayette Street and construction of a Twenty-Four (24) unit residential building with surface parking for Fifty-One (51) vehicles and related improvements. The subject property is located within a Residence C zoning district and shown on City of Quincy Assessors' Map No. 6107 / 29 / 5.

Attorney Edward Fleming, Fleming and Fleming, 85 Clay Street, Quincy, stated that he represents Galvin Development Company, Quincy. Attorney Fleming gave a general outline of the proposal. He noted that Mr. Sean Galvin and Scott Galvin were present, as well as Mr. James Burke of DeCelle-Burke and Associates, Quincy. The parcel is 38,452 sf and is presently zoned as Residence C because the City Council recently rezoned this parcel from Industrial, Attorney Fleming explained. The site was used for many years by the Wollaston Foundry Company. The existing building on the site has been vacant for about 15 years, and

there has been some vandalism, so it is in very poor shape now—an eyesore. This site was actually part of the Stop and Shop PUD proposal, Attorney Fleming stated, but ended up not being used by Stop and Shop. The proposed project before the Board could be a nice buffer between the commercial uses in the area and the abutting neighborhood.

The building will be razed, and a new 24-unit, four-story building will be constructed. The proposed building will be much smaller than the existing structure, allowing for plenty of parking. The plan is for condo units, 21 two-bedroom units and 3 three-bedroom units, along with a 51-space parking lot with 3 handicapped parking spaces. Attorney Harrington explained the unusual shape of the parcel, which is surrounded by public ways. Attorney Fleming said that the project was before the Zoning Board of Appeals last night (3/11/14) for some dimensional relief, and the requested relief was granted, a Special Permit granted. In addition, the project was before the Conservation Commission, as it is in a flood zone, and a Notice of Intent was filed and an Order of Conditions was issued. Attorney Fleming noted that the project was reviewed by the City's peer review firm Beals & Thomas as well as the Planning Department's project manager Mr. Nicholas Verenis.

8:21 PM: Mr. Sean Galvin, Galvin Companies, 21 Totman Street, Quincy, stated that he and his brother have been looking at this site that Stop and Shop owned for quite some time, and have made offers to buy the site multiple times and now finally own the site. Stop and Shop originally wanted to build a gas station on the site, but the idea was not something the neighbors approved of. Mr. Galvin explained how he met with the Ward Councillor about six years ago and the idea of a segway development from a commercial area to a neighborhood area was well received. Mr. Galvin used a display plan to show the existing building's footprint, which takes up most of the lot. Chairman Geary asked a question about an abutting parcel and building (31 Fayette Street/F. Wang), and Mr. Galvin stated that it is a one-story commercial warehouse building with many business within it. Mr. Galvin also stated that he did try to acquire the parcel when developing the proposal before the Board but was unable to.

Mr. Galvin used display plans to show and describe the proposed four-story building, which will be on the corner of Fayette Street and Holbrook Road. Some features are that the height of the building was kept down by incorporating the roof structure into the fourth floor—a mansard-type roof design, and there is at least one parking space for each bedroom in the building. He also pointed out that each unit has a private balcony, and noted that there are six units on each floor. The building design was modeled after the 45 Hancock Street residential building near the Adams Inn that was also constructed by Galvin Companies. There are three residential abutters—a five-family building that abuts on Farrington Street; a two-family building on Holbrook Road, and a one-family on Holbrook Road. Mr. Galvin stated that there is good traffic flow and pedestrian access. The site is located three blocks from the MBTA and close to amenities—restaurants, shopping, etc. Mr. Galvin explained the exterior of the building, which is designed using a transitional look so the area flows from a commercial area into a neighborhood. The first level will be brick, and the upper levels will be plank with color and extreme durability, with a traditional asphalt roof above that. In response to Member Meade's question, Mr. Galvin said the building's height is 39'-5-1/2". There are 51 parking spaces, of which 3 are handicap spaces.

Mr. Jim Burke, DeCelle-Burke and Associates, Quincy, stated that the site is an impervious site, and soil testing was done and found to be coarse sand, which will allow some recharge. Mr. Burke gave a few quick details on the drainage plan, stating that established groundwater is about 90 inches, and there will be some large cultec chambers. Mr. Burke stated that the project will meet all the stormwater conditions required. Existing services will be cut and capped, and new ones installed—including domestic, fire protection and sewer. Chairman Geary asked if there was any contamination found, and Mr. Burke stated that nothing was found to be “reportable conditons.” Mr. Galvin stated that a Phase I Study (21E) was required for the financing, and there were no reportable conditions found.

The Chairman asked about landscaping. Is the border of the parking area going to be masked? Yes, stated Mr. Galvin, there are shrubs around the roadway and the building and trees to match those on surrounding properties—such as the 99 Restaurant side of the street. Mr. Galvin explained that there will be a lawn around the building as well as a fence that separates the property from the sidewalk, and a stockade which will provide privacy for the neighbors. The commercial abutting building will be screened by shrubbery.

Attorney Fleming stated that Councillor Coughlin filed a letter of support last night (3/11/14) at the Zoning Board of Appeals. Councillor Coughlin held a neighborhood meeting which was attended by about 50 people, and no-one spoke in opposition to the project and some spoke in favor, added Attorney Fleming.

Chairman Geary explained the Public Hearing process, where the public has the option to either speak or sign in favor or in opposition to a proposal, to comment or ask a question, or submit written comments.

No-one signed in favor or in opposition to the proposal.

Ms. Donna Keating, 45 Holbrook Road, Quincy, stated that she likes the proposal because it will clean up the area. She does have a concern, she said, about the flood plain and she hopes the development does not make the flooding worse. She was also concerned about the tear down process and any rodent or other health issues. Mr. Galvin explained that the building would have to be exterminated before tear down, and other steps are required to be followed.

8:40 PM

MOTION: by Member Meade to close the Public Hearing

SECOND: Member Fay

VOTE: 5-0 MOTION CARRIES

Mr. Nicholas Verenis, Planning Department, Economic Development, and project manager for this proposal, introduced the peer reviewer, Mr. George G. Preble, PE, President, Beals & Thomas, Plymouth, MA. Mr. Preble referenced his 2/28/14 peer review report letter, stating that there were concerns regarding the stormwater management plans and clarification was needed. Other concerns included the excess parking that was provided and whether some space could be used for landscaping instead of parking, pedestrian access, and where snow

storage would be located, as well as the increased flooding potential of the site. Mr. Burke responded to the report, and substantially revised plans were submitted. Mr. Preble noted that the soil testing that was done on the site was not done under the building; soil conditions need to be confirmed. A snow storage area away from the transformer needs to be planned. Member Barry asked if there would be any benefit to one-way traffic. Mr. Preble stated that there would not be any benefit realized. Member Barry stated that he is happy with the landscaping plan overall, and there was some discussion about how to maximize landscaping, such as taking a few parking spaces and adding some grassy area(s). There was discussion around the snow storage plan, and it was suggested three parking spaces be used to store snow as needed.

In response to a question from Member Comiso about the impact of adding about 50 vehicles to this neighborhood, Mr. Preble stated that it probably won't make much of a difference due to the traffic volume in the area. Also, because of the close proximity to the MBTA station (about 3 blocks), many people may not use their cars to commute. Member Comiso asked about the expected resident population type. Mr. Galvin said that the development would most likely attract young professionals with two people per unit, with a price point of \$350k-\$370 per unit. Mr. Galvin stated that they own several similar residential developments within the same proximity to public transportation, and the number of units that have two cars generally run about 60% to 70%. One parking space will be assigned to each unit. Member Barry asked what measures are planned to be bike friendly. Mr. Galvin stated that there is room for bike storage within these condo units.

8:58 PM: Mr. Verenis referred to his 3/12/14 departmental recommendation letter (revised 3/13/14 per Planning Board outcome and part of the Decision document). Mr. Verenis read the proposed Conditions into the record:

1. The Applicant adequately address the concerns of the City Engineer in a memo dated February 27, 2014, and comments from peer review in a letter dated February 28, 2014, specifically regarding storm water management.
2. The Applicant will follow recommendations of the City's Health Department in a letter dated February 24, 2014.
3. Proof of approval from the Quincy Conservation Commission to be made part of the administrative record.
4. Provide approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals after the March 11, 2014, meeting of that Board pertaining to Agenda Item 14-004.
5. The Applicant provide an approved snow storage plan either on-site or off-site.
6. Because of proximity to public transit system, and assist in efforts to decrease automobile use, the Applicant should decrease the number of parking spaces to 48.
7. Construction hours will be allowed on Monday through Friday from 7am to 5pm and on Saturdays from 9am to 4pm. No construction or related deliveries will be allowed on Sundays.
8. Applicant will comply with Quincy Zoning Ordinance Title 17, Section 7.1 of the Affordable Housing Ordinance.

Mr. Verenis recommended that the space used for snow storage is green space. The location of the snow storage would most likely be at the north end of the property.

9:00 PM

MOTION: by Member Meade to Approve the Site Plan Review with Conditions

SECOND: Member Fay

VOTE: 5-0 MOTION CARRIES

Business Meeting: (continued)

Agenda Item 1:

Annual Election of Planning Board Officers: Chairman, Vice Chairman, Clerk

9:04 P.M. **Nominations for Chair**

William Geary nominated by Richard Meade

Seconded by James Fay

Vote by name: Four Members in favor of William Geary (Chairman abstained)

9:05 P.M. **Nominations for Vice Chair**

Coleman Barry nominated by James Fay

Seconded by Richard Meade

Vote by name: Unanimous in favor of Coleman Barry

9:06 P.M. **Nominations for Clerk**

James Fay nominated by Richard Meade

Seconded by Glen Comiso

Vote by name: Unanimous in favor of James Fay

Other Business:

Planning Director Harrington asked that the Board take time to nominate, vote and appoint Member Richard Meade to be the person authorized to sign plans on behalf of the Board when the Director is not available, though noting that this is not an official office. The Director noted that Member Richard Meade is currently the person authorized to execute plans.

9:07 PM

MOTION: by Member Fay that Member Richard Meade continue to be the person authorized to sign plans on behalf of the Board when the Director is not available

SECOND: Member Barry

VOTE: 5-0 MOTION CARRIES

Business Meeting: (continued)

Agenda Item 2:

600R Crown Colony Drive, Planning Board Case No. 2014-01, Planning Board filing deemed incomplete—awaiting state (MEPA) permitting conclusion

Planning Director Harrington stated that there is a significant project plan that has been filed with the City of Quincy for 500 residential units. It was filed on behalf of the Flatley Company and located at 600 Crown Colony Drive. From the Director's past experience, he stated that there are significant MEPA site issues. Director Harrington stated that when there was a first meeting with the Applicant, it was indicated that the Planning Department would want to know if the state permitting was resolved. The Director stated that a MEPA certificate was filed and approved for the office park, and then there was another change in the MEPA designation when the highway north ramp was built. A project change is needed, and this project has been determined to be categorically included in MEPA's requirements for environmental impact report—more than 300 parking spaces and more than 50,000 gallons sewer discharge on a daily basis. For that reason—as well as needing indirect access permits from highway—the project needs to go through MEPA review, Director Harrington stated.

The application was given a technical denial, but fees and the package of information was not returned. This action stopped the clock from running. The Applicant suggested that the action taken by the Planning Department may not have been an option available to be taken by the Department, the Director explained. The opportunity is afforded to move forward on the project, as long as the Applicant commits to finishing the MEPA approval. Director Harrington stated that he does not believe that any City should move forward with permitting a huge project without it having the proper state permits. In response to Member Fay's question, Director Harrington stated that the proposal is for the last major parcel in the office park, and is about ½ Million square feet. There are still a couple of 60,000 square foot sites remaining. Member Barry asked for an explanation of where the parcel is located. The Director explained the site, which is located on the left side of the Marriott as you approach from the road, and above the highway ramp, very high up.

9:15 PM

MOTION: by Member Meade to adjourn

SECOND: Member Fay

VOTE: 5-0 MOTION CARRIES